



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/528,073	03/17/2005	Andres Valkna	0552-0160PUS1	2784
2292	7590	02/12/2008	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			BRISTOL, LYNN ANNE	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1643		
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		02/12/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/528,073	VALKNA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lynn Bristol	1643	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 19-28 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 19-28 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 19-28 are all the pending claims subject to lack of unity restriction.
2. Claims 24 and 25 are "use" claims and drawn to non-statutory subject matter under U.S. practice according to 35 U.S.C. 101. The claims are withdrawn from examination. Applicants are invited to amend the claims to meet the statutory requirements in their reply to this Office Action.

Lack of Unity: Restriction

3. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

In assessing whether the requirements of unity of invention of an application are met, identification of the technical features that each solution to a technical problem contributes over the prior art (special technical features) must be made. If then a technical relationship between the solutions, involving one or more of the same technical features, can be recognized, the requirements of unity of invention are said to be met.

The claims of the present application relate to a fusion protein comprising a) a scFV and b) cell penetrating transport peptide. A fusion protein comprising elements a) and b) were already known before the priority date of the present application. For example, the inventive concept underlying the present claims is already disclosed in Zhao et al. (J. Immunol. Method. 254:137-145 (2001)) where antibodies that penetrate membranes of living cells without affecting cell viability and which are covalently attached to a transmembrane translocating sequence (MTS) are taught. Zhao also

discloses a potential therapeutic use of the antibodies (Abstract; p. 137, col. 2, ¶1 – p. 138, Col. 1, ¶1). Thus Zhao renders claims 19, 23, 26, 27 and 28 obvious, and these claims appear to lack inventive step. The problem to be solved by the present application is the provision of cell penetrating antibodies, and since GLI proteins, GLI antibodies and their use in medicine is already disclosed by Toftgaard (WO 01/12655; 2/22/01; p. 11, line 30- p. 12, line 23) it would be obvious and with reasonable expectation of success to combine the teaching with Zhao, hence Claim 20 is considered to lack inventive step. Since cell-penetrating peptides such as Transportan, TP10 and Arg 9 were already disclosed in the prior art (Rothbard (WO 98/52614; 11/26/98) and Lindgren et al. (Trends in Pharm. Sciences 21:99-103 (3/2000)) one skilled in the art would have had sufficient motivation to use the peptides especially when the advantages can be readily foreseen, hence Claim 21 is not considered to involve an inventive step. The subject matter of Claim 22 refers to obtaining the scFv from a human genome and is also not considered to be inventive since the features are merely several straightforward possibilities from which the skilled person would select in accordance with circumstances, without the exercise of inventive skill, in order to solve the problem of the invention.

As no technical features can be distinguished which, in light of the prior art, could be regarded as special technical features on which a unifying concept could be based, there is no single inventive concept underlying the plurality of claimed inventions.

4. This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. The resulting separate inventions, as presently identified, have been grouped according to the order in which they have been claimed.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-23 and 26, drawn to a fusion protein comprising a) a scFV and b) cell penetrating transport peptide; a fusion protein having a medical use; and a pharmaceutical composition comprising at least one fusion protein.

Group II, claim(s) 27, drawn to a method of making the fusion protein.

Group III, claim(s) 28, drawn to a method of treating a disease or disorder in a human or animal comprising administering the fusion protein.

5. The invention of Group I is related to the invention of Groups II and III as product and product of using. The inventions are separate and distinct because the fusion protein can be made a different method than the method of Group II and the method of treating a disease or disorder of Group III can be practiced with a different product such as small molecule therapy.

6. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the

requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

7. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lynn Bristol whose telephone number is 571-272-6883. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:00, Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Helms can be reached on 571-272-0832. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LAB



LARRY R. HELMS, PH.D.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINE^P